REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicant greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephone conversation of 3/28/2005.

Claims 1-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over San Andre et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,489) in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,244). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of San Andre and Bowman-Amuah teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-49.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "initiating a context grouping the operations, wherein the group is one of at least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation; performing the operations within the context, each operation resulting in an outcome; combining the outcomes; determining an overall outcome based on a combination of the outcomes for each operation."

Referring to claim 1, San Andre teaches transaction replication services on a network for updating server content (see col. 2, lines, 33-40). San Andre does not teach or suggest "initiating a context grouping the operations, wherein the group is one of at least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation" as claimed in claim 1. San Andre teaches that "the same update transaction" is replicated on a plurality of servers on a network (see col. 3, lines 56-58). The replicated transaction of San Andre is not analogous "the group is one of at least <u>two messaging operations, or</u> at least <u>one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation</u>" as claimed in claim 1. At most, San Andre teaches one replicated transaction. Therefore, San Andre does not teach or suggest "the group is one of at

least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation" as claimed in claim 1.

Bowman-Amuah teaches the bundling of requests and bundling of responses (see col. 301, line 38 to col. 302, line 30). Bowman-Amuah does not teach or suggest "initiating a context grouping the operations, wherein the group is one of at least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation" as claimed in claim 1. Similar to San Andre, the requests of Bowman-Amuah are transactions (see Abstract). A bundle of transactions as taught by Bowman-Amuah is clearly not "at least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation," as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Bowman-Amuah fails to cure the deficiencies of San Andre.

At most, the combined teachings of San Andre and Bowman-Amuah teach a bundle of update transactions. Therefore, the combined teachings of San Andre and Bowman-Amuah fail to teach or suggest "initiating a context grouping the operations, wherein the group is one of at least two messaging operations, or at least one messaging operation and at least one transactional operation" as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claim 1. Claims 16-49 have been cancelled.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-15 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
Fax: (516) 692-8889